



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

continues his employment with knowledge of unusual dangers caused by the employer's negligence, without receiving a promise to remove them, has as a matter of law, voluntarily assumed the risk. *Lamson v. American Axe & Tool Co.*, 177 Mass. 144, 58 N. E. 585; *St. Louis Cordage Co. v. Miller*, 126 Fed. 495; but see 27 HARV. L. REV. 284. In England, however, whether or not the assumption was voluntary is a question of fact for the jury. *Smith v. Baker*, [1891] A. C. 325. And the jury may take into account the economic pressure on the servant caused by fear of losing his position. *Yarmouth v. France*, 19 Q. B. D. 647. See *Walsh v. Whiteley*, 21 Q. B. D. 371, 374. In adopting both phases of the English view, the principal case marks a material departure from previous federal decisions. *McPeck v. Central Vt. Ry. Co.*, 79 Fed. 590. Under Section 4 of the Federal Employers' Liability Act, if the employer's negligence consists in the breach of a statutory duty, the defense of assumption of risk is expressly excluded. U. S. COMP. STAT. SUPP. 1911, p. 1323. But where, as in the principal case, the negligence violates no statute, there has been some conflict as to whether or not the defense is still available. A recent United States Supreme Court decision, however, settled the dispute in favor of allowing the defense. *Seaboard Air Line Ry. v. Horton*, U. S. Sup. Ct. No. 691, April 27. See cases collected in 47 L. R. A. N. S. 38, 62. The decision in the principal case, however, will certainly reduce its application to a minimum, for as a practical matter the employee's assumption of risk will seldom be found truly voluntary.

MASTER AND SERVANT — WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT — INJURY OCCURRING "IN THE COURSE OF" AND ARISING "OUT OF" EMPLOYMENT. — The deceased was engaged as a seaman under articles in which the Board of Trade compulsory scale of diet was struck out, and a provision that the crew should provide their own provisions substituted. The deceased went ashore for provisions and was drowned while returning. Held, that the accident did not arise out of the employment since there was no contractual obligation that deceased should provide his food. *Parker v. Owners of Ship Black Rock*, 136 L. T. J. 375 (Ct. App., Feb., 1914).

The deceased was employed as drayman continuously from eight A.M. till eight P.M., with no interval for meals. He left his team to get a glass of beer, and was killed by a motor car while returning. Held, that the accident arose out of the employment, since thus leaving the team was a reasonable incident thereof. *Martin v. Lovbond & Co.*, 136 L. T. J. 402 (Ct. App., Feb., 1914).

The English cases have generally held an accident to arise "out of" the employment when it results from a risk incidental to the employment as distinguished from a risk common to all mankind. See 27 HARV. L. REV. 390. A sailor who must depend upon his own efforts to secure food seems, because of his employment, peculiarly subject to the risks attendant on going ashore. More doubtful is the unique character of the risk incurred by the drayman of injury from passing motor cars. It is, however, a risk incidental to his employment, and the more likely to happen by reason of the same; and allowing recovery seems fully in accord with the spirit of the legislation. For discussion of this question see article by Professor Bohlen in 25 HARV. L. REV. 328-348, 401-427, 517-547.

MASTER AND SERVANT — WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACTS — WHETHER OCCUPATIONAL DISEASE IS A "PERSONAL INJURY." — As the result of continuous exposure to furnace gases in the course of his employment, the plaintiff contracted a disease which destroyed his eyesight. The Workmen's Compensation Act provided for compensation for "personal injury arising out of and in the course of the employment." Held, that the plaintiff is entitled to compensation. *In re Hurle*, 104 N. E. 336 (Mass.).